



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/587,318	06/05/2000	Kiril A. Pandelisev	PHOENIX	8159
7590	04/26/2006		EXAMINER	
James C Wray 1493 Chain Bridge Road Suite 300 McLean, VA 22101				EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/587,318	PANDELISEV, KIRIL A.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	George R. Evanisko	3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2005.

2a)  This action is FINAL.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-41, 84, 85 and 87-105 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 42-83 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-34, 36, 38-40, 85 and 87-105 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 35, 37, 41 and 84 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.  
\_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Claims 42-83 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 4.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 26, 39, and 87-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ostrow et al (5344384). Ostrow describes and shows two individual controls/generators for the EM cells in figure 6 and an individual generator/control for the electrostimulation pads in figure 11, mounted in a console, 24, that is mounted on one base wrapped around the waist (figure 1) and remote from the other bases. In addition, it is inherent that the system contain some sort of controls, such as software or hardware controls (the computerized chip, column 4), to provide the pulses to the EM or electrostimulation cells since the batteries alone could not provide the pulses to the cells.

Claims 1-3, 26, 32, 87, and 89-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Browner (3025857). Browner is capable of meeting the functional use recitations presented in the claims. In addition, for claims 89-101, the controls inherently provide control of

the pulse characteristics, such as pulse shape, width, frequency modulation, etc, since the pulses inherently have these properties.

Claims 1-6, 16, 22-25, 27-34, 36, 38, 39, and 87-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Russek (4381012). Russek is capable of meeting the functional use recitations presented in the claims. In addition, Russek states in columns 4 and 6 that “dual” channel devices/controls can be used and therefore will provide the independent controls. In addition, the controls inherently provide control of the pulse characteristics.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15, 27-31, 34, 36, 38-40, 85, 87-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over McLeod et al (5518496).

McLeod teaches a device for controlling tissue growth (title) comprising a thin and flexible base in the form of straps or belts (134, 136, figures 1-3) on which a plurality of cells (130 and 132) are arranged and self contained power sources (148, column 5, lines 45-50) magnetic field sensor, 146 or 204, and microprocessor, 162 or 200, being enclosed in the pads to individually control the pads. It is noted that column 4, lines 63-67, states that although two pads are used, a plurality of pads greater than two can be used and therefore provides for the multiple pads, controls, power supplies, individual controls, etc. For claim 5, the power source is

mounted on the base since the pads are mounted on the base. For claim 27, it is inherent that there is some type of channel/conduit on the base since the signal/power wires must connect to the coils some way. In addition, for claims 89-101, the controls inherently provide control of the pulse characteristics, such as pulse shape, width, frequency modulation, etc, since the pulses inherently have these properties.

In the alternative, McLeod discloses the claimed invention except for the plurality of cells mounted on the base (such as 4 cells representing two independent treatment systems). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the therapy system and method as taught by McLeod, with the plurality of cells mounted on the base (such as 4 cells representing two independent treatment systems) since it was known in the art that therapy systems and methods use a plurality of cells mounted on the base (such as 4 cells representing two independent treatment systems) to provide multiple independent treatment areas over an increased area to provide treatment at the same time to numerous areas that need treatment. Evidence of this can be seen in the devices of Russek, Browner, or Ostrow.

Claims 5, 6, 34, 36, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ostrow et al (5344384). Ostrow shows in figure 1 the console/power source mounted and connected to the base on one end of the base. In addition, for claim 85, it is inherent that the type, frequency, pulse, etc. of the energy is varied according to the size and type of wounded tissue and proximity of the cell to the wounded tissue, since the device is meant to heal the wounded tissue.

In the alternative, Ostrow discloses the claimed invention except for the power source mounted or connected to the base (one end of the base) and varying the type, frequency, pulse

characteristics, etc of the energy according to the size and type of wounded tissue and proximity of the cell to the wounded tissue. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the therapy device as taught by Ostrow, with the power source mounted or connected to the base and varying the type, frequency, pulse characteristics, etc of the energy according to the size and type of wounded tissue and proximity of the cell to the wounded tissue since it was known in the art that therapy devices mount or connect the power source to the base to provide a single therapy system that allows the patient to conveniently and easily carry the therapy unit and power source in one unit and/or to prevent signal/power cords from becoming entangled and since it was known in the art that therapy devices vary the type, frequency, pulse characteristics, etc of the energy according to the size and type of wounded tissue and proximity of the cell to the wounded tissue in order to provide an effective therapy that heals the wound and neither causes further damage to the wound or not enough energy to heal the wound.

Claims 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostrow et al in view of McLeod et al (5518496).

Ostrow discloses the claimed invention having the controls connected to the batteries, a field generator coil, coil enclosure and insulation except for the sensors in the base with the frequency and field strength being variable with increasing frequencies in proximity to the wounds to be treated. McLeod teaches that it is known to provide sensors for each cell to vary the therapy based on the output signal with the frequency and field strength being variable with increasing frequencies in proximity to the wounds to be treated to provide the appropriate and correct therapy. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the therapy device as taught by Ostrow, with the sensors for each cell with the frequency and field strength being variable with increasing frequencies in proximity to the wounds to be treated as taught by McLeod, since such a modification would provide a therapy device with sensors for each cell to vary the therapy based on the output signal with the frequency and field strength being variable with increasing frequencies in proximity to the wounds to be treated to provide the appropriate and correct therapy.

Claims 16, 22-25, 27-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostrow et al in view of Russek (4381012).

Ostrow discloses the claimed invention except for control conduits mounted on the base/cell to carry power and/or signal cables and an on/off switch connected to the cables, the controls mounted on one or both ends of the base, and remote controls connected to the controls. Russek teaches that it is known to provide control conduits mounted on the base/cell to carry power and/or signal cables (figures 5-12) to provide a therapy base that prevents the power and /or signal cables/wires from becoming entangled with the patient or other elements of the system and to provide the controls mounted on one or both ends of the base to provide a self contained unit that is easy to operate without control wires becoming entangled and teaches that it is known to provide remote controls (on/off, figure 13) connected to the controls for controlling the cells remotely to allow more convenient control by a patient who has limited movement. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the therapy device as taught by Ostrow, with control conduits mounted on the base/cell to carry power and/or signal cables, the controls mounted on one or both ends of the base, and the remote controls (on/off) connected to the controls as taught by Russek, since such a modification

would provide a therapy device with control conduits mounted on the base/cell to carry power and/or signal cables to provide a therapy base/cell that prevents the wires from becoming entangled with patient or other elements of the system, since such a modification would provide a therapy device with controls mounted on one or both ends of the base to provide a self contained unit that is easy to operate without control wires becoming entangled, and since such a modification would provide remote controls (on/off) connected to the controls for controlling the cells remotely to allow more convenient control by a patient who has limited movement.

Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostrow in view of Russek as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of McLeod et al.

Ostrow in view of Russek discloses the claimed invention with the cables being power and/or signal cables and an on/off switch connected to the cables, the cells having cables, field generator coils, insulation and coil enclosures except for the cell shielding. McLeod teaches that it is known to use shielding between components in each cell to prevent undesired interactions between components. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the therapy device as taught by Ostrow in view of Russek, with the shielding between components in each cell as taught by McLeod, since such a modification would provide a therapy device with shielding between components to prevent undesired interactions between components.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 35, 37, 41, and 84 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Evanisko whose telephone number is 571 272 4945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571 272 4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

George R Evanisko  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3762

GRE  
April 24, 2006

4/24/06